

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 7, DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 271, CONDEMNING THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S LEGAL CAMPAIGN TO TAKE AWAY AMERICANS' HEALTH CARE; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 274

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 271) Condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health Care. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of April 4, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 274. It provides for the consideration under closed rules for S.J. Res. 7, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and for the consideration of H. Res. 271, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of Committee on Energy and Commerce. It also provides suspension authority for Thursday, April 4.

Madam Speaker, before I begin, I want to recognize that today marks the 230th anniversary of the Rules Committee being formally constituted for the first time.

Now, the Ways and Means Committee—which my Massachusetts friend and colleague, RICHIE NEAL, chairs—likes to point out that they are the oldest standing committee in the House. While that is true, I would like to remind my friends that the Rules Committee is the oldest committee in the House, being first created on this day in 1789 as a select committee. So it is especially appropriate that we are on the floor today to do some important work before us.

For the record, Madam Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee can celebrate their 230th anniversary on July 24.

Now that I have cleared that up, the first measure included in this rule is S.J. Res. 7, and we are taking action on this because Yemen is in crisis. In a country of roughly 28 million people, an estimated 22 million of them are in need of humanitarian assistance.

That is 75 percent of the population facing famine, disease, and displacement. Half the country is at risk of starvation.

The famine and disease facing children is particularly sobering. Save the Children estimates that as many as 85,000 children under the age of 5 have died because of hunger and disease since 2015.

All told, this is one of the world's worst humanitarian crises, the site of the fastest growing cholera epidemic ever recorded and the biggest food emergency on the planet.

Yet, it wasn't caused by some natural disaster. It is entirely man-made, the result of a Saudi-led military conflict. Seemingly every day, bombs fall on weddings, hospitals, buses, and homes, as civilian neighborhoods are regularly targeted.

This is not some abstract war happening half a world away. In fact, the United States is intimately involved in this conflict. We have supported the Saudi reign of terror by providing logistics, intelligence, ground support, and midair fueling of bombers. Virtually all the bombs that fall on Yemen say "Made in the United States of America."

Make no mistake, Madam Speaker, the United States is involved in a war

in Yemen today. But if our constituents look through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they wouldn't find a vote authorizing it. That is because this body abdicated its responsibility to declare war when it began 4 years ago.

□ 1230

Now, we took one of our most sacred responsibilities and handed it to the executive branch. It is not the first time we have done it, but it is becoming a habit around here. We first let the Bush administration decide the contours of our involvement abroad, and that continues through the Trump administration today.

If that wasn't outrageous enough, past Republican Congresses used every legislative trick in the book to block Members from even debating our role there. On two separate occasions, they went so far as to strip War Powers Resolutions related to Yemen of their privilege. It was unprecedented.

But when it comes to Saudi Arabia, this administration and my Republican friends were all too content to look the other way when they murdered a Washington Post journalist. They lured him into a consulate in Turkey, they murdered him, and then they used a bone saw to dismember him. We know, based on our intelligence reports, that the highest level of the Saudi Government was involved in that terrible human rights atrocity, and the Trump administration did nothing. They rationalized it. They justified it. They basically turned a blind eye.

When it comes to human rights, this administration has abdicated its moral authority. That should be of concern to everybody in this Chamber, whether you are Democrat or Republican, because if the United States stands for anything, we need to stand out loud and foursquare for human rights. If the President of the United States and his administration don't want to do it, then we should.

No Congress should be complicit in abdicating our Article I constitutional responsibility. Thankfully, this Democratic Congress is doing the opposite. We are reasserting our power, and we are taking a stand when it comes to human rights.

Thanks especially to the dedication of Speaker PELOSI, Chairman ENGEL, Congressman RO KHANNA, Congresswoman JAYAPAL, Congressman POCAN, and the entire Congressional Progressive Caucus, we are considering a bipartisan measure that makes clear it is time for the United States' involvement in Yemen to end. No more excuses.

This is virtually identical to the resolution we passed in February. The difference this time is that this is the first opportunity that this House has had to send something on the war in Yemen right to the President's desk.

So I urge all of my colleagues: seize this opportunity. We have a constitutional responsibility and we have a moral obligation to get this done.

Don't let any legislative maneuvers deter us from ending our Nation's complicity in this humanitarian catastrophe. Let's pass this resolution free of changes that would prevent it from going right to the President.

Let me make that more clear: if we change a single word, we will derail this resolution.

Now, the second measure included in this rule is H. Res. 271, in response to a war of a different kind: the Republican war on healthcare. The Trump Justice Department recently moved in Federal Court not only to strike down preexisting condition coverage under the Affordable Care Act, but to overturn this law completely.

If the President succeeds in *Texas v. U.S.*, the protections for preexisting conditions will be gone. The Medicaid expansion will be nullified. Insurance premiums will skyrocket. I could go on and on and on and on.

Striking down the Affordable Care Act would be a tragedy felt by every single American. We would return to the days when our health insurance marketplace was like the Wild West, when insurers were free to decline or limit coverage because someone had acne, or received an organ transplant, or even because they were a victim of domestic violence. That is how messed up our system was, and that is the system that this President and many of my colleagues want to return to.

Now, for the life of me, I cannot understand what President Trump and his allies in Congress have against Americans getting healthcare. For nearly a decade now, they have worked endlessly to sabotage the Affordable Care Act through Congress, the courts, and administrative actions. Apparently, they are not happy that 20 million people have gained healthcare coverage because of this law, or that 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions can get care. We should be celebrating these advancements. But, instead, some on the other side won't be satisfied until the Affordable Care Act is repealed completely.

Now, this Democratic majority has taken a different course. On the very first day of this Congress, we brought the full weight of the House of Representatives to bear in this lawsuit. As a result, the House Counsel has already intervened in this case to protect the healthcare Americans depend on.

Now, this resolution is our chance to speak with one voice against the administration's attempts to abolish the ACA. I have seen my friends on the other side issue sternly worded press releases and strongly worded letters to the administration. But now it is time to back up words with votes, and then I hope they will work with us moving forward as this majority takes action to reverse the administration's healthcare sabotage and strengthen healthcare for every single American.

Madam Speaker, I believe that healthcare ought to be a fundamental right for every single person in this

country. It is unconscionable to me that rather than working with us to strengthen the Affordable Care Act and rather than working with us to expand healthcare protections, my Republican friends have chosen instead to wipe it out. I don't know how anybody could think like that. I don't know what motivates the President of the United States and some on the other side of the aisle to move in that direction.

Now we are told by the President that even though he doesn't have a plan to replace this, if he succeeds in nulling and voiding the Affordable Care Act, he said: Well, we will provide you one in the year 2021.

So, Madam Speaker, the man who has spent all of his time trying to rip protections away from people with preexisting conditions, the person who wants to not allow you to keep your kids on their insurance until they are 26, the leader of our country who doesn't believe in capping insurance when it comes to people with lifetime illnesses, the person who doesn't want to lower the cost of prescription drugs—I could go on and on and on and on—says: I want to repeal it, I want it gone, I want the courts to null and void it; and then just trust me, and then we will come up with some magical plan, some secret plan, after the election.

I don't think the American people are going to fall for that kind of nonsense, and they shouldn't because healthcare is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. It is a moral issue. It is not even an issue, it is a value that all of us should share.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support us in sending a message loud and clear to the administration that we have had enough of their attempts to sabotage the healthcare bill, we have had enough of their trying to take health insurance away from the American people, and that we are going to stand here and make it very clear that we do believe that everybody is entitled to good healthcare in this country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, we are here again considering one nonbinding resolution and a second resolution that will never become law. Both of these prevent us from focusing on the real business of Congress, which is to legislate.

The first, H. Res. 271, is a resolution condemning the Trump administration's recent position in the case of *Texas v. United States*.

So let's revisit that for a minute. Republicans are supportive of protecting access to health insurance for individuals with preexisting conditions. This resolution today will not advance the development of any policies to improve healthcare for the American people. There are options that the Democrats could have brought to the floor to

lower healthcare costs and increase access to care; such legislation would indeed be worthy of our time. But, instead, we are debating expressions that basically amount to political posturing.

The first vote the Republicans called this year was a motion to require legislation protecting individuals with preexisting conditions. Surprisingly, the Democrats voted against that previous question. In 2017, as part of the proposed replacement for the Affordable Care Act, Republicans included legislation that would have preserved access for those with preexisting conditions.

Speaker PELOSI has already intervened on behalf of the House in *Texas v. United States*. While the Department of Justice has weighed in, the department is not litigating the case. As with every other legal case, this will play out in the courts. If Congress must act following the final legal decision, certainly we stand ready to do so. In fact, if the Democrats wanted to void this case, they know their options. They could repeal the individual mandate or they could reinstitute the tax on the individual mandate or they could provide a severability clause that was somehow left out when the Affordable Care Act was passed the first time. But we have seen them do none of those options.

The legal process will take time, and no Americans will lose access to their healthcare while the legal process is being heard. Unlike the case of *Texas v. United States*—which we know will not affect coverage because the judge in that case has issued a stay—individuals covered by what are known as association health plans may actually lose their coverage due to uncertainty in the legal outcome of that case. For last week, a Federal judge in the case of the State of New York, et al. v. Department of Labor, last week a Federal judge ruled that the Department of Labor's final rule on association health plans was not legal.

Association health plans provide employers who otherwise might struggle to provide health insurance for their employees to access the group market through an association, based either on geography or a line of business. The Washington Post recently reported that there are initial signs that association health plans are "offering generous benefits and premiums lower than found in the ObamaCare marketplaces."

Association health plans have provided additional choices for Americans seeking innovative healthcare options, but these choices may soon disappear as a result of the lawsuit State of New York, et al. v. the Department of Labor.

The Democrats are using the case of *Texas v. United States* to delay explaining their real ideas. Their real idea is a one-size-fits-all healthcare. The so-called Medicare for All would be a terrifying reality for our Nation. The Democrats' Soviet style, government-

run, single-payer healthcare bill would not provide access to quality healthcare for Americans. Instead, it would lead to a massive tax increase, eliminate private insurance, and bankrupt the already dwindling Medicare trust fund.

Constituents in my district back in Texas are struggling to afford their health insurance under the Affordable Care Act, and I am certain that we are not the only ones suffering from high premiums and very high deductibles.

Madam Speaker, what good is health insurance if you are afraid to use it because you can't afford your deductible?

This is an issue that I would actually like to see us tackle. But I am confident that a government-run, single-payer system would only further deteriorate our Nation's healthcare.

As the son of a physician who chose to leave Canada because of their system of socialized medicine, I worry that the central state control of healthcare would further damage the doctor-patient relationship. As a physician, I do not believe that the government should hinder a doctor's ability to act in the best interest of his or her patient. I wish the concept of government dictating a physician's practice and decisions was unthinkable, but I find myself here today having to deconstruct the idea of further government control of healthcare.

The House Democratic proposal would implement a global budget, and once that has been set, hospitals and institutions would be required to stick to that for all outpatient and inpatient treatment.

What happens if the budget runs out?

Are the patients simply told: Sorry, we ran out of money, you may try again next year?

Today we should be focusing on the parts of the health insurance market that are working for Americans. For example, 71 percent of Americans are satisfied with their employer-sponsored health insurance. This provides robust protections for individuals with preexisting conditions under ERISA law—a 1970 law, not the 2010 Affordable Care Act. Quite simply, the success of employer-sponsored insurance is not worth wiping out for single-payer healthcare.

Since President Trump took office—and this is important—since the President took office, the number of Americans in employer-sponsored health coverage has increased.

How much has that increased?

I can't precisely tell you because our Congressional Budget folks have not seen fit to give us new coverage numbers.

But since the President took office, how many people are employed that were previously unemployed?

The number is somewhere between 3 and 6 million, and a significant number of those individuals have employer-sponsored health insurance who had no insurance before.

□ 1245

The coverage numbers under President Trump, if the story is ever told, have gone up. Today, there is a greater percentage of Americans in employer-sponsored health coverage than at any time since the year 2000. That is why it is astonishing that House Democrats would want to abolish that insurance option entirely.

Instead of building on the success of our existing health insurance framework, Democrats' radical single-payer, government-run policy would simply tear it down. It would eliminate employer-sponsored health insurance, eliminate all private insurance, eliminate Medicaid, and eliminate CHIP.

Existing Medicare beneficiaries would not be exempt from harm, as the policy would raid the Medicare trust fund, which is already slated to go bankrupt in 2026.

Our Nation's seniors count on the existence of Medicare for their retirement healthcare needs. They have paid into it their entire working lives. How are we supposed to inform them that not only do the Democrats want to endanger their access to Medicare services, but, unbelievably, they will want to increase their taxes also?

There is no question that this policy could be catastrophic for America's patients today and for generations to come.

At least now there is some degree of honesty. Remember, a previous administration said, if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Now at least there is some degree of honesty.

You can't keep your doctor. You can't keep your insurance. You can't keep your personal liberty. You get nothing. Effectively, it would end all the parts of our healthcare system that are, in fact, working for the American people.

Quite simply, single-payer healthcare would be another attempt at a one-size-fits-all approach to healthcare. We know this: Americans are all different. A universal healthcare plan will not meet the varying needs of each and every one of us as individuals. Single-payer is not one-size-fits-all. It is really one-size-fits-no-one.

Again, to restate the obvious: Since the beginning of this Congress, we have heard it. Through the last Congress, we heard it. Republicans support protections for individuals with preexisting conditions.

Instead of spending our time here today worrying about the judicial branch, we could focus on our job as members of the legislative branch. We should be actively working to better our healthcare system, not spending time taking votes that will fail to accomplish any real objective.

Madam Speaker, the second resolution included in this rule directs the removal of the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

We considered this resolution once before. At that time, Republicans suc-

cessfully passed a motion to recommit that declared the House's opposition to anti-Semitism. However, this version of the bill does not include that important provision, and we are again debating legislation that is, in fact, based on a false premise.

The resolution is fundamentally flawed. United States forces are not engaged in hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Iranian-backed Houthi forces in Yemen. Previously, the United States was providing midair refueling to Saudi Arabia but ceased this assistance in November 2018. The United States continues to provide limited intelligence-sharing and limited logistics support, which does not amount to engagement in hostilities.

The Trump administration is focused on countering al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula and the Islamic State, mitigating the humanitarian crisis in Yemen and assisting our allies.

The United States does not command, coordinate, accompany, nor participate in counter-Houthi operations or any hostilities other than those directed at al-Qaida and the Islamic State.

I might, here, just add: Those activities against the Islamic State have been significantly successful over the last 2 years.

This resolution sets a dangerous precedent. America has a security agreement with Saudi Arabia, just as we do with 117 other countries, including our NATO allies Canada, Australia, South Korea, and Israel. If this resolution were to become law, it could set a precedent that could prevent us from assisting allies and prevent us from meeting our treaty obligations. Rather than condemning a type of assistance that is no longer being provided by the United States, we should be finding ways to aid the millions of Yemenis at risk of starving to death.

Limiting how our forces can engage in the region will only further exacerbate this conflict and not help bring it to a conclusion.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I have to give the Republicans credit for one thing. They are consistent on the issue of healthcare, in trying to avoid talking about the issue at hand.

We are not talking about universal healthcare, although I support universal healthcare. We are not talking about Medicare for All, although I personally support Medicare for All. We are not talking about the Canadian system or the German system or any other system.

We are talking about preventing this President and his Republican allies from null and voiding the Affordable Care Act, thereby taking away healthcare protections for every single American. We are talking about preventing the President from throwing

tens of millions of people off health insurance. We are talking about protecting the over 100 million people in this country who have preexisting conditions. That is what we are talking about.

I loved it when the gentleman from Texas said that the first vote that the Republicans asked for in this Congress was a procedural motion to protect people with preexisting conditions. Does the gentleman not know that people with preexisting conditions already have protections under the Affordable Care Act?

I mean, it sounds to me—and it seemed to me at the time—that that Republican procedural vote was about covering your rear and not about serious legislating, about trying to get the American people to believe that we really do care about healthcare and we really do care about protecting people with preexisting conditions, even though we all know here that that is just not the case.

When I hear the gentleman say that the Republicans care deeply about people's healthcare and want to make sure that everybody gets coverage, it is just not true. The reason I say that so emphatically is because I have been around here for the last few years, and I have watched the dozens of votes that the Republicans have brought up, one after another after another after another after another, to repeal healthcare protections for people in this country without proposing an alternative.

Now, the President is saying: Trust us.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Politico article that just appeared that is entitled "Trump punts health care until after 2020."

[From POLITICO, April 1, 2019]

TRUMP PUNTS HEALTH CARE UNTIL AFTER 2020

(By Quint Forgy and John Bresnahan)

JUST LAST WEEK THE PRESIDENT HAD SEEMED TO GO ALL IN ON A NEW EFFORT TO WIPE OUT OBAMACARE

President Donald Trump signaled Monday that congressional Republicans would wait until after the 2020 elections to vote on a GOP replacement for Obamacare—putting off a presumably savage legislative battle on a hot-button campaign issue until after his re-election bid.

"Everybody agrees that ObamaCare doesn't work. Premiums & deductibles are far too high—Really bad HealthCare! Even the Dems want to replace it, but with Medicare for all, which would cause 180 million Americans to lose their beloved private health insurance," the president tweeted.

"The Republicans . . . are developing a really great HealthCare Plan with far lower premiums (cost) & deductibles than ObamaCare," Trump continued. "In other words it will be far less expensive & much more usable than ObamaCare. Vote will be taken right after the Election when Republicans hold the Senate & win . . . back the House."

Trump claimed that the as-yet-unseen Republican proposal "will be truly great HealthCare that will work for America," writing online that "Republicans will always support Pre-Existing Conditions."

The unexpected string of tweets added drama to a week that has seen Obamacare return to the fore as a policy issue.

The president's pledge comes days after his Justice Department endorsed a federal court ruling to eliminate the Affordable Care Act in its entirety, moving to invalidate the landmark health care law despite objections within Trump's orbit from Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar and Attorney General William Barr. The ruling by District Judge Reed O'Connor had suggested that the Obamacare statute, which has passed muster with the Supreme Court, was actually wholly unconstitutional.

The president appeared on Capitol Hill the next day, saying that the Republican Party "will soon be known as the party of health care."

Trump's call to again put Obamacare repeal on the table for Hill Republicans was seen as a potential disaster-in-the-making by GOP leaders, who knew their incumbents and candidates were badly hurt by it last November. And it was an invitation to Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) to pound home the issue once more, as she plans to do with a House vote this week condemning the administration's decision not to defend Obamacare in court.

Trump's efforts to eradicate Obamacare have also endangered some of the administration's health initiatives, such as lowering prices for prescription drugs and combating opioid abuse and HIV.

In public and private, Republican leaders made clear that they didn't want anything to do with the president's most recent maneuver. They begged Trump to back down and made their displeasure known to other administration officials, as well.

GOP lawmakers even took the position that if Trump wanted to lay out his own health care proposal, then they would be willing to look at it. But Senate Republicans—facing a tough electoral fight to maintain their majority in 2020—have refused to sign on to a new administration drive before seeing the specifics, giving them room to disavow any Trump proposal if it hinders their own political outlook.

"I look forward to seeing what the president is proposing and what he can work out with the speaker," Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said in a brief interview Thursday, adding: "I am focusing on stopping the Democrats' 'Medicare for None' scheme."

McConnell is up for re-election this cycle, as are vulnerable GOP incumbents including Cory Gardner of Colorado and Susan Collins of Maine, who said she doesn't want the Justice Department to push to strike down Obamacare.

The Affordable Care Act has been a thorn in the side of Republicans since it was enacted in 2010. After the GOP took back the House in the midterm elections that year, GOP lawmakers repeatedly passed legislation designed to repeal Obamacare.

Once Trump was elected president on a promise of different and better health care options, Republicans seemed on the path to finally scrapping the law, only to see a 2017 "skinny repeal" effort fail unexpectedly in the Senate. That attempt collapsed when Arizona Sen. John McCain—upset with the irregular way the legislation was being handled—stunned his colleagues by voting against it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The President says: Repeal everything, and then we will share our secret plan after the election.

Give me a break. The bottom line is that the American people want us to be on their side, not on the side of big health insurance corporations, not on

the side of big drug companies. They want us to be on their side.

It wasn't too long ago when people would be provided insurance that didn't cover anything. It was junk insurance. There are people on the Republican side and people in this White House who are eager to get back to those bad old days.

Stop trying to take away people's healthcare. Stop trying to get in bed with corporate interests that basically are fighting every attempt to make sure that people have access to good, quality care in this country.

By the way, if they repealed the Affordable Care Act, that repeals essential benefits protections, which guarantee that every insurance company has to provide you coverage when you get sick. That wasn't always the case.

This is a ridiculous fight that we are having here. I cannot believe, after the midterm elections, after it was made crystal clear by the American people to the Republicans that they wanted no part of their effort to take away healthcare in this country, that here we are doing it all again.

Now, maybe they didn't intend it this way. The President wasn't on message and came out for repealing the Affordable Care Act outright, and now they have to kind of scramble to try to, again, cover their rears. That is what is happening here.

It is really disillusioning, I think, for people who are observing these proceedings that we are back again fighting over whether or not people are entitled to good healthcare, whether people are entitled to protections under our healthcare laws.

I think this is a ridiculous fight for the Republicans to be waging. But if they want to fight it, they own it. I think they will see, in 2020, that the American people are having none of it.

Madam Speaker, on the war in Yemen, we cannot wait. The starving children in Yemen cannot wait on this President or on my Republican colleagues to do the right thing.

Just to highlight how bad the war is, here are a few statistics. I noticed the gentleman from Texas barely talked about how horrific the situation is in Yemen, but let me give you a few statistics.

Madam Speaker, 130 children under 5 die each day from hunger and disease as a result of this war. The number of cholera cases in Yemen is 1 million. You heard that right. This is the largest cholera outbreak in recent history. Finally, 3-year-olds in Yemen have lived through 18,000 air raids already.

As I mentioned in my opening statement, the bombs that are dropping on civilian populations say "Made in the United States of America." All of us should be outraged by that, and not only by the Saudi Government's behavior in Yemen, but the Saudi Government's behavior in general.

Yet, what is the response by this administration and their Republican allies? Send Saudi Arabia more weapons.

Sell them more weapons. Turn a blind eye to what is going on in Yemen. Let's make believe that the murder of Washington Post journalist Jamal Khashoggi never happened.

Again, we need to stand firmly on the side of human rights.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, here is one of the uncomfortable truths of the Affordable Care Act: Under the law, every Member of Congress was supposed to be covered under the Affordable Care Act. Obviously, the pay and benefits of a Member in Congress exceed the subsidy limits, so these would be unsubsidized healthcare.gov policies. But then Speaker of the House John Boehner, then-Leader of the United States Senate Harry Reid, and President Obama himself all intervened. They were fearful that Members of Congress might leave.

There might be a brain drain in Congress—if such a thing was, in fact, possible—if Members of Congress were required to put their health insurance under the Affordable Care Act, so they created an exception for Members of Congress, and Members of Congress only. They are the only people in the United States who can do this. There is a tax-free subsidy that a Member of Congress can walk into the D.C. exchange and get their coverage in the D.C. exchange.

I rejected that option because: Number one, I didn't think it was right. Number two, I didn't think it was legal. I thought it was going to be taken away from us. Apparently, no one else shared my concern because it still exists.

It does make me wonder why we would not offer a health reimbursement account, and I have brought this up several times in committee, where that same tax-free subsidy could be available to any American to walk into a health insurance plan of their choosing. Why not give the people of the country what Members of the Congress so generously bestowed upon themselves?

I didn't take the option to go into the D.C. exchange. I didn't take the option of the tax-free subsidy that went along with it. I bought an unsubsidized health insurance plan in healthcare.gov, signed up for it October 1, 2012. Many of you may remember that. We were in the process of shutting the government down at the time. It was in all the papers.

I started that process October 1, 2012. The check cleared the middle of January 2013. I went that entire time not knowing if I would have health insurance in healthcare.gov the next year because I couldn't get an answer to any questions.

You couldn't call the people at healthcare.gov. You would try, and you would be put on hold. You would stay on hold for a long period of time. You

would eventually get to talk to a person. You would get cut off. You would have to start all over at the beginning. It was a miserable process.

The point is, Members of Congress should have gone through that. We should have had to deal with what we pushed off on the American people, at least those people in the individual market.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say you have got to love the Republicans. I mean, they have been in charge of this House for 8 years previously. They were in charge of the entire government the previous 2 years. They had the House, the Senate, and the White House. They didn't even need a supermajority in the United States Senate to be able to get whatever they wanted through, and they couldn't do it.

So the bottom line is this: You had your chance. The American people rejected your attempt to take away healthcare from millions of people. The American people believe people with preexisting conditions ought not to be discriminated against by insurance companies, and so they are having none of what you are selling here.

So you can make excuses all you want, but, unfortunately for the country, you were in charge of the House, the Senate, and the White House for the previous 2 years.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), who has been a leader on the issue of Yemen, and I commend him for his efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman MCGOVERN for his leadership in finally bringing up for a vote this resolution on Yemen and for the terrific people on his team, Don Sisson; on Speaker PELOSI's team, Keith Stern, and Shuwanza Goff; and on Majority Leader HOYER's team, who finally allowed for a vote, with the work of Keane Bhatt and Geo Saba.

Let me explain why this matters. As the chairman alluded to, there are 14 million people in Yemen who currently face the possibility of famine—14 million.

I was with Martin Griffiths, the Special Envoy to the United Nations, about 2 weeks ago, and he said, if we do not act in the next couple of months, that situation will become irreversible.

The explanation for this famine is pretty simple. The gentleman from Texas said we need to get more aid in there. I respect that, sir, but the problem is that the Saudis have a blockade on Yemen; they are not allowing the aid to get in. Every day we wait, it makes it harder for us to reverse the famine.

So the solution is very simple: We need to have the Saudis lift the blockade and let food and medicine get to the people who need it to prevent the largest humanitarian crisis and the largest famine the world has ever seen.

Now, the gentleman from Texas said that the administration has already stopped the refueling, and in that, he is actually correct. The administration has stopped the refueling. But the reason they stopped the refueling is precisely because Congress acted, because the Senate passed the War Powers Resolution.

All we are asking to happen now is to codify that policy so that the refueling doesn't begin again. That is why this shouldn't be a partisan issue. The President should want to sign this War Powers Resolution.

The gentleman from Texas said, well, what difference will it make if we have already stopped? The difference this will make is sending a clear, unambiguous message to the Saudis that they can no longer continue a policy of intentional cruelty, of trying to have a nation, through starvation, submit to their will. That is why this is a bipartisan issue. If we pass this, then that message will be heard by the Saudis, and that is why we had bipartisan support in the Senate and in the House for this resolution.

The gentleman from Texas said, well, this is going to hurt our relationships with Israel or other allies. That is just false. That is just false.

The amendment, the Buck amendment, that was in our resolution, or the amendment that is in the Senate resolution, makes it clear that we still can have intelligence sharing with any ally and does not touch any of our treaties.

People often say why am I so passionate that, of all the issues, I decided to take up Yemen in my first term. I will tell you why.

In 1943, there was a famine in West Bengal; 3 million people perished. My grandfather was in jail in 1943 in India when that famine took place. And there was indifference—indifference—by the British Government. They let 3 million people die.

As the United States, we should not allow for another famine, and we should do everything in our power, as a House, to stop it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the Republican leader of the second oldest committee in the United States Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BURGESS for his leadership on healthcare in so many ways.

Madam Speaker, embarrassingly designed and hastily written by our Democratic colleagues, the Affordable Care Act, from day one, has come under legal and public scrutiny, and for obvious reasons. This disastrous healthcare experiment, written behind closed doors and stuffed with special

interest giveaways, has driven up healthcare costs for millions of working families so high that more Americans eligible for the Affordable Care Act have rejected it than have chosen it.

Now, as ObamaCare's ever-increasing failures continue to find their way into our courts, Democrats are asking us to condemn the Justice Department's handling of this process.

No matter how Democrats try to frame this stunt, the left is misleading the American people with this political and partisan move. The continuation, regrettably, of falsehoods that Democrats continue to elevate in order to protect this unconstitutional law is really a disservice to the Americans and the patients who hope to have affordable care. We can and must do better as we work to protect patients and lower healthcare costs.

Madam Speaker, the truth is Republicans, creators of the children's healthcare program; creators of part D, the Medicare prescription drugs for seniors; creators of Medicare Advantage, are committed to improving our healthcare system.

If the Court strikes down the Affordable Care Act, Republicans will act to protect those with preexisting conditions. We will work to make healthcare more affordable, guaranteeing that folks can see local doctors or go to their local hospitals, and we will preserve other important provisions, such as no lifetime limits and allowing kids to stay on their parents' plans till age 26. These are shared priorities that patients and families deserve to have secured.

If our Democratic colleagues who drafted this flawed law want to join Republicans, why not start fresh, this time, both parties working together to pass a law that is truly constitutional, that actually lowers costs and that will actually protect patients? We welcome that conversation with open arms.

So I am proud to join with my colleague, the Republican leader of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, GREG WALDEN, to introduce a resolution that calls for this Congress to work together to do just that, because one thing is crystal clear: Republicans won't let the courts take away preexisting protections or let Democrats take away your health plan at work.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on this political stunt so that we can actually start working together toward making our healthcare system more convenient and more affordable for families across this country.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas, the former chair of the Ways and Means Committee. But I just want to remind my colleagues again that my Republican friends have been in charge of this institution for 8

years. They were in charge for 2 years of the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, and they showed us what they were about.

The gentleman says that they are not going to let the courts take away protections for people with preexisting conditions. Well, my Republican friends tried to do that on dozens of occasions. They brought legislation to the floor that would have ripped protections away from people with preexisting conditions. That is their record. It is there for anybody to see.

Now they are saying: "Oh, we are now for protecting people with preexisting conditions"? Their whole existence in the majority has been about taking protections away from people. Give me a break. I mean, people know what is going on here.

I appreciate the resolution that the gentleman wants to offer to say we all should work together. Look, I am happy to work with my Republican friends to find ways to improve protections for people.

But I want to remind them, when they were in the majority, they didn't want anything to do with us because we wanted to protect people's healthcare. We wanted to protect people with preexisting conditions. We wanted to make sure that parents could keep their kids on their insurance until they were 26. We wanted to lower the cost of prescription drugs. We wanted to put a cap on people with chronic illnesses so that they wouldn't go bankrupt. We wanted to make sure that insurance companies had to offer you real protections. We had essential benefit protections there.

So we are happy to build on that. What we are not happy to do is to work with them to take these things away, and that is what their leadership has been all about for 8 years in the House. And then when they controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House, that is what they tried to do.

Thankfully, some thoughtful Republicans in the Senate didn't go along with it, so they didn't get their way. And now they are trying to use the courts to try to undermine what this body has done.

Madam Speaker, let me inquire of the gentleman from Texas how many more speakers he has.

Mr. BURGESS. I have as many as I need.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Okay. Then I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. It will be me.

Mr. MCGOVERN. We were expecting one more speaker, but she didn't show up. If the gentleman is ready to close, I am ready to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to move a resolution that reinforces our long-held views that every American should have preexisting condition protections.

On the opening day of the 116th Congress, House Republicans brought a measure to the floor that called on lawmakers to legislate on locking in protections for patients with preexisting conditions. Unfortunately, in a fit of partisanship, the Democrats blocked this effort.

If the Democrats were serious, they would take up legislation immediately to protect patients with preexisting conditions. Instead, Democrats are trying to score political points.

Our position is simple and clear: Republicans stand ready to protect those with preexisting conditions in a manner that will withstand judicial scrutiny. This is why, if the previous question is defeated, House Republicans will move a resolution that:

Maintains that no American should have their health insurance taken away or lose protections for preexisting conditions due to the Democrats in Congress enacting an unconstitutional law;

Instructs Congress and the Trump administration to immediately ask the Court for a stay in this decision;

Guarantees that no American citizen can be denied health insurance or coverage or charged more due to previous illness or health status;

Includes commonsense consumer protections;

Provides more choice and affordable coverage than the Affordable Care Act;

Lowers prescription drug prices for patients;

Strengthens Medicare for current and future beneficiaries; and

Rejects the Democrats' radical, one-size-fits-all, government-run healthcare that would outlaw the employer-based coverage of more than 150 million Americans.

Finally, it is important to note that *Texas v. the United States*, the case that is working its way through the courts, did not immediately end ObamaCare and will not affect insurance coverage or premiums for calendar year 2019. Several legal steps remain before the courts reach a final conclusion.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman is agreeable, I am prepared to close.

So, in closing, while Republicans stand ready to legislate, we are again considering unnecessary resolutions. The first seeks to condemn the position of the Department of Justice in *Texas v. the United States*, the case in which the Department of Justice is not a party.

As I have stated several times, Republicans support protecting coverage



for preexisting conditions. I would hope we could work together to find a way to make health insurance affordable for all Americans rather than considering a divisive messaging resolution.

The resolution to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in Yemen is not only unnecessary, but may prevent future assistance for our allies.

□ 1315

The brave men and women who are assisting Saudi Arabia in the fight against al-Qaida and the Islamic State are working to find solutions to the humanitarian crisis that is unfolding in Yemen, a mission for which we should be unified in our support.

Madam Speaker, with that, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question, and a “no” on the underlying measures.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I just find it a little bit interesting that for the last couple of days, my Republican friends have been assailing us for introducing a sense of Congress resolution, and here we have a sense of Congress resolution from them.

I guess you can't make this stuff up.

But in any event, look, I will say to my colleagues, you don't need to defeat the previous question to make clear that you believe that people with preexisting conditions should be protected, because this sense of Congress wouldn't do that.

We have a law that does that now, a law that, unfortunately, my Republican friends have been trying to repeal for years.

So if Members want to protect people with preexisting conditions, then they ought to support us on our sense of Congress resolution.

So, Madam Speaker, when it comes down to it, both of these resolutions that we are offering today are about what this Congress is willing to tolerate, whether we are willing to tolerate our Nation's involvement in the Saudi-led war in Yemen, despite never having authorized it in the first place. Do we really want our Nation to be partners with a regime that murders journalists like Jamal Khashoggi?

President Trump has said of Saudi Arabia: “They have been a great ally.” Well, I disagree.

And I hope that this Congress will now speak with one voice that we will not look the other way when it comes to the murder of a U.S. reporter, that we will not look the other way when it comes to the murder of innocent people in Yemen, bombing school buses, bombing weddings, bombing funerals.

Enough. We have to say enough. We are no longer okay with the U.S. and Yemen going on unchecked for another year.

This is about whether this Congress is going to tolerate the administration

trying to rip away millions of people's healthcare as well. I know I am not—and many of my colleagues aren't either—willing to tolerate that.

This morning, I joined with many Members of Congress in the House and Senate, including Leader PELOSI and Senator SCHUMER. We marched from the House and the Senate to the Supreme Court to call on this administration to stop its assault on Americans' healthcare.

Abolishing the Affordable Care Act may be just a talking point to the President, but this law is literally a matter of life and death for people. Millions and millions of Americans could lose their insurance coverage. Premiums and out-of-pocket costs could skyrocket, and lifesaving healthcare could once again be out of reach.

The President and his allies claim to support protections for preexisting conditions, they claim that the Republican Party is the party of healthcare, but their actions say otherwise.

When this House voted on the first day of this Congress to allow us to intervene in *Texas v. U.S.*, more than 190 Republicans sided with the President on his brutal assault on Americans' healthcare.

The majority is not going to stand for it.

Enough is enough. Enough with the unauthorized wars abroad, enough with the assault on people's healthcare.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the previous question, this rule, and the underlying resolutions.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong and unequivocal support for the rule governing debate on H. Res. 271 as well as the underlying resolution and ask all Members to join me in supporting this resolution which condemns the Trump Administration's ongoing legal campaign to take away health care from more than 100 million Americans and to make health care dramatically less affordable for those fortunate enough to be insured.

I thank Congressman ALLRED, my Texas congressional delegation colleague, for introducing this important resolution.

As a new member of Congress who unseated an opponent who voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act dozens of times, the gentlemen from Texas knows first-hand how important and critical access to affordable, high quality, accessible health care available to everyone, including those with pre-existing conditions, to the well-being of American families.

Because of the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the national uninsured rate has been slashed from 14.8 in 2012 to 8.89 percent in 2018.

Texas has long led the nation in rate of uninsured so the comparable rates are 24.6 and 15 percent, respectively.

Madam Speaker, I distinctly recall a candidate for the highest public office in the land saying “Obamacare is a disaster” and appealing for voters to support him with this question:

“What have you got to lose?”

The question deserves a response so I hope that person, who occupies the Oval Office, is listening to my answer.

The Affordable Care Act, or “Obamacare,” has been an unmitigated success to the more than 20 million Americans who for the first time now have the security and peace of mind that comes with affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Madam Speaker, Tip O'Neill used to say that “all politics is local” so let me share with you how Obamacare has dramatically changed lives for the better for the people in my home state of Texas.

1.874 million Texans who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented could lose their coverage if the ACA is entirely or partially repealed or invalidated.

1.1 million Texans who purchased high quality Marketplace coverage now stand to lose their coverage if *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.), the lawsuit brought by Republican Governors, and now whole-heartedly supported and aided by the Trump Administration were to succeed.

913,177 individuals Texans who received financial assistance to purchase Marketplace coverage in 2016, averaging \$271 per individual, are at risk of having coverage become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates the premium tax credits.

1.1 million Texans could have insurance if all states adopted the ACA's Medicaid expansion; these individuals will not be able to gain coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the Medicaid expansion.

508,000 kids in Texas who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented are also at risk of having their coverage rolled back.

205,000 young adult Texans who were able to stay on a parent's health insurance plan thanks to the ACA now stand to lose coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the requirement that insurers allow children to stay on their parents' plans until age 26.

646,415 Texans who received cost-sharing reductions to lower out-of-pocket costs such as deductibles, co-pays, and coinsurance are now at risk of having healthcare become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates cost-sharing reductions.

10.28 million Texans who now have private health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductibles stand to lose this access if the Republican Congress eliminates ACA provisions requiring health insurers to cover important preventive services without cost-sharing.

Women in Texas who can now purchase insurance for the same price as men are at risk of being charged more for insurance if the ACA's ban on gender rating in the individual and small group markets is invalidated.

Before the ACA, women paid up to 56 percent more than men for their health insurance.

Roughly 4.5 million Texans who have preexisting health conditions are at risk of having their coverage rescinded, being denied coverage, or being charged significantly more for coverage if the ACA's ban on pre-existing conditions is struck down.

346,750 Texas seniors who have saved an average of \$1,057 each as a result of closing the Medicare prescription drug “donut hole” gap in coverage stand to lose this critical help going forward.

1.75 million Texas seniors who have received free preventive care services thanks to ACA provisions requiring coverage of annual wellness visits and eliminating cost-sharing for

many recommended preventive services covered by Medicare Part B, such as cancer screenings, are at risk of losing access to these services if congressional Republicans go forward with their plan to repeal the ACA.

The Affordable Care Act works and has made a life-affirming difference in the lives of millions of Americans, in Texas and across the country.

This is what happens when a visionary president cares enough to work with a committed and empathetic Congress to address the real issues facing the American people.

You want to know why the American people have Obamacare?

It is because Obama cared.

The same cannot be said about this Republican president and congressional Republicans who have made careers of attacking and undermining the Affordable Care Act's protections and benefits for the American people.

I urge all Members to vote for H. Res. 271 and send a powerful message to the President and the American people that this House will not stand idly by as this Administration tries to take away health care from more than 130 million persons.

Instead, this House will resist by all constitutional and appropriate means, including opposing this Administration in the courts and by passing the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," which will lower health insurance premiums with strengthened and expanded affordability assistance by:

1. strengthening tax credits in the Marketplace to lower Americans' health insurance premiums and allows more middle-class individuals and families to qualify for subsidies;

2. ensuring that families who don't have an offer of affordable coverage from an employer can still qualify for subsidies in the Marketplace; and,

3. providing funding for reinsurance, to help with high-cost claims, improve Marketplace stability, and prevent the Administration's sabotage from raising premiums.

The "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," will also strengthen protections for people with pre-existing conditions by curtailing the Administration's efforts to give states waivers to undermine protections for people with pre-existing conditions and weaken standards for essential health benefits.

These improper waivers leave consumers with less comprehensive plans that do not cover needed services, such as prescription drugs, maternity care and substance use disorder treatment.

Another way the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," protects consumers is by prohibiting insurance companies from selling junk health insurance plans that do not provide coverage for essential medical treatments and drugs, or cover people with pre-existing medical conditions.

The material previously referred to by Mr. BURGESS is as follows:

#### AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 274

Strike section 2 of the resolution and insert the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 280), Protecting the health care of all Americans, especially those with pre-

existing conditions. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 280.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 191, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

#### YEAS—231

Adams	Delgado	Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar	Demings	Kuster (NH)
Allred	DeSaunier	Lamb
Axne	Deutch	Langevin
Barragán	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Bass	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Beatty	Doyle, Michael	Lawrence
Bera	F.	Lawson (FL)
Beyer	Engel	Lee (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Escobar	Lee (NV)
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Levin (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Españillat	Levin (MI)
Bonamici	Evans	Lewis
Boyle, Brendan	Finkenauer	Lieu, Ted
F.	Fletcher	Lipinski
Brindisi	Poster	Loeb
Brown (MD)	Frankel	Lofgren
Brownley (CA)	Fudge	Lowenthal
Bustos	Gallego	Lowey
Butterfield	Garamendi	Luján
Carbajal	Garcia (IL)	Lurla
Cárdenas	Garcia (TX)	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Golden	Malinowski
Cartwright	Gomez	Maloney
Case	Gonzalez (TX)	Carolyn B.
Casten (IL)	Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean
Castor (FL)	Green (TX)	Matsui
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	McAdams
Chu, Judy	Haaland	McBath
Cicilline	Harder (CA)	McCollum
Cisneros	Hastings	McGovern
Clark (MA)	Hayes	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Heck	Meeks
Clay	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Cleaver	Hill (CA)	Moore
Clyburn	Himes	Morelle
Cohen	Horn, Kendra S.	Moulton
Connolly	Horsford	Mucarsel-Powell
Cooper	Houlahan	Murphy
Costa	Hoyer	Nadler
Courtney	Huffman	Napolitano
Cox (CA)	Jackson Lee	Neal
Craig	Jayapal	Neguse
Crist	Jeffries	Norcross
Crow	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran
Cuellar	Johnson (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Cummings	Kaptur	Omar
Cunningham	Keating	Pallone
Davids (KS)	Kelly (IL)	Panetta
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pappas
Davis, Danny K.	Khanna	Pascarella
Dean	Kildee	Payne
DeFazio	Kilmer	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kim	Peters
DeLauro	Kind	Peterson
DelBene	Kirkpatrick	Phillips

Pingree	Schrier	Tonko
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Torres (CA)
Porter	Scott, David	Torres Small
Pressley	Serrano	(NM)
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Trahan
Quigley	Shalala	Trone
Raskin	Sherman	Underwood
Rice (NY)	Sherrill	Van Drew
Richmond	Sires	Vargas
Rose (NY)	Slotkin	Veasey
Rouda	Smith (WA)	Vela
Roy	Soto	Velázquez
Roybal-Allard	Spanberger	Visclosky
Ruiz	Speier	Wasserman
Ruppersberger	Stanton	Schultz
Ryan	Stevens	Waters
Sánchez	Suozzi	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Swalwell (CA)	Welch
Scanlon	Takano	Wexton
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Wild
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
Schneider	Titus	Yarmuth
Schrader	Tlaib	

#### NAYS—191

Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)	Nunes
Allen	Gooden	Olson
Amash	Gosar	Palazzo
Amodei	Granger	Palmer
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Pence
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Posey
Babin	Graves (MO)	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Green (TN)	Reed
Baird	Griffith	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Grothman	Rice (SC)
Banks	Guest	Riggleman
Barr	Guthrie	Roby
Bergman	Hagedorn	Rodgers (WA)
Biggs	Harris	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Rooney (FL)
Brady	Hice (GA)	Rose, John W.
Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Rouzer
Brooks (IN)	Hill (AR)	Scalise
Buchanan	Holding	Schweikert
Buck	Hollingsworth	Scott, Austin
Bucshon	Hudson	Sensenbrenner
Budd	Huizenga	Shimkus
Burchett	Hunter	Simpson
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Smith (MO)
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Smith (NE)
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Smucker
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Spano
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Staubert
Cheney	Joyce (PA)	Stefanik
Cline	Katko	Steil
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Steube
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Stewart
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Stivers
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Taylor
Comer	Kinzinger	Thompson (PA)
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Thornberry
Cook	LaHood	Timmons
Crawford	LaMalfa	Tipton
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Turner
Curtis	Latta	Upton
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Wagner
Davis, Rodney	Long	Walberg
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Walden
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Walker
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Walorski
Duncan	Marchant	Waltz
Dunn	Marshall	Watkins
Emmer	Massie	Weber (TX)
Estes	McCarthy	Webster (FL)
Ferguson	McCaul	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Westerman
Fleischmann	McHenry	Williams
Flores	McKinley	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Meadows	Wittman
Foxx (NC)	Meuser	Womack
Fulcher	Miller	Woodall
Gaetz	Mitchell	Wright
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Yoho
Gianforte	Mullin	Young
Gibbs	Newhouse	Zeldin
Gohmert	Norman	

#### NOT VOTING—9

Abraham	Mast	Perry
Correa	McEachin	Rush
Gabbard	Mooney (WV)	Rutherford



□ 1343

Messrs. RESCHENTHALER and SCALISE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. BASS changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS). The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—230

Adams	Eshoo	Luria
Aguilar	Españillat	Lynch
Allred	Evans	Malinowski
Axne	Finkenauer	Maloney,
Barragán	Fletcher	Carolyn B.
Bass	Foster	Maloney, Sean
Beatty	Frankel	Matsui
Bera	Fudge	McAdams
Beyer	Gallego	McBath
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	McCollum
Blumenauer	Garcia (IL)	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (TX)	McNerney
Bonamici	Golden	Meeks
Boyle, Brendan	Gomez	Meng
F.	Gonzalez (TX)	Moore
Brindisi	Gottheimer	Morrell
Brown (MD)	Green (TX)	Moulton
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Mucarsel-Powell
Bustos	Haaland	Murphy
Butterfield	Harder (CA)	Nadler
Carbajal	Hastings	Napolitano
Cárdenas	Hayes	Neal
Carson (IN)	Heck	Neguse
Cartwright	Higgins (NY)	Norcross
Case	Hill (CA)	O'Halleran
Casten (IL)	Himes	Ocasio-Cortez
Castor (FL)	Horn, Kendra S.	Omar
Castro (TX)	Horsford	Pallone
Chu, Judy	Houlahan	Panetta
Cicilline	Hoyer	Pappas
Cisneros	Huffman	Pascarell
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Payne
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Clay	Jeffries	Peters
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Clyburn	Johnson (TX)	Phillips
Cohen	Kaptur	Pingree
Connolly	Keating	Pocan
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Porter
Costa	Kennedy	Pressley
Courtney	Khanna	Price (NC)
Cox (CA)	Kildee	Quigley
Craig	Kilmer	Raskin
Crist	Kim	Rice (NY)
Crow	Kind	Richmond
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Rose (NY)
Cummings	Krishnamoorthi	Rouda
Cunningham	Kuster (NH)	Roybal-Allard
Davids (KS)	Lamb	Ruiz
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Davis, Danny K.	Larsen (WA)	Ryan
Dean	Larson (CT)	Sánchez
DeFazio	Lawrence	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Scanlon
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
DelBene	Lee (NV)	Schiff
Delgado	Levin (CA)	Schneider
Demings	Levin (MI)	Schrader
DeSaulnier	Lewis	Schrier
Deutch	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lipinski	Scott, David
Doggett	Loebach	Serrano
Doyle, Michael	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
F.	Lowenthal	Shalala
Engel	Lowey	Sherman
Escobar	Luján	Sherrill

Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Suozzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Cook  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Fox (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert

Abraham  
Bergman  
Correa  
Gabbard  
Mast

Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres Small  
(NM)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela

NAYS—188

Gonzalez (OH)  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hern, Kevin  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lesko  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaull  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Meuser  
Miller  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mullin  
Newhouse

NOT VOTING—13

McEachin  
Mooney (WV)  
Perry  
Riggleman  
Rooney (FL)

□ 1353

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 140 and “nay” on rollcall No. 141.

Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, to protect the right to life for innocent children who are born alive instead of allowing the State-sponsored murder after birth, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, if that is the case, I would ask the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately bring that bill to the floor to allow us all to stand up for the sanctity of life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

CONDEMNING THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S LEGAL CAMPAIGN TO TAKE AWAY AMERICANS' HEALTH CARE

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 271.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 274, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 271) Condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health Care, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 271

Whereas on February 26, 2018, 18 State attorneys general and 2 Governors filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Texas v. United States, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.) (in this preamble referred to as “Texas v. United States”), arguing that the requirement of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) (in this preamble referred to as the “ACA”) to maintain minimum essential coverage is unconstitutional and, as a result, the court should invalidate the entire law;

Whereas in a June 7, 2018, letter to Congress, then Attorney General Jefferson Sessions announced that the Department of Justice—